

ficially created natural boundaries, such as the beltway. I would see no inconsistency between the two.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Clagett.

DELEGATE CLAGETT: Delegate Gallagher, may I make an inquiry? With respect to the inquiry of Delegate Weidemeyer a moment or so ago, that the language, "adjoining territories," is ironclad, am I not correct in interpreting "territory" to include territorial waters?

I know of no water that sits upon anything other than territory or land in that restricted sense, but that is a restricted definition. Therefore, adjoining territory would include territorial waters.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gallagher.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Let me state this, as I understand it. The Chairman has stated that there is no body of water, is that correct, Mr. Chairman, no body of water —

THE CHAIRMAN: — that is not included in any county. All county lines, not all, but most county lines, go through the center of rivers or other bodies of water.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Again I am afraid we are getting into the hassle we had last evening on the question of adjoining, which I am doing my best to avoid at the moment, and I suspect that what Delegate Adkins is about to rise to again.

The Supreme Court of the United States had used the word "contiguous" heretofore. I do not know whether or not under that interpretation they jumped bodies of water, but I suspect they probably did.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Bamberger.

*(There was no response.)*

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Adkins.

DELEGATE ADKINS: Would the Chairman yield for a question?

THE CHAIRMAN: State the question.

DELEGATE ADKINS: Delegate Gallagher, you were quite helpful this morning in clarifying certain problems which I and my constituents had in connection with 3.02.

As some of the language in 3.02 is the same, although slightly different as to the language this proposed amendment contains, in view of the fact that you gave an explanation in 3.02 this morning, which

in some way slightly differs from the explanation that you have given this afternoon in connection with the proposed amendment, may the record show that your explanation of the language insofar as it was used in 3.02, that is, the explanation you gave this morning, is intended to control 3.02 without being buried by any potential or possible conflict as a result of your explanation in connection with the proposed amendment?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gallagher.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Yes, I would agree that the explanation as given this morning is the intention that the Committee had with respect to the use of the word "adjoining" in 3.02.

To be consistent and without having to consult with my Committee, and without having consulted the other 20 sponsors on this particular amendment, which someone was kind enough to put my name at the beginning of, I would say that, "adjoining" would continue to be interpreted in the same way that I interpreted it with respect to 3.02.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Adkins.

DELEGATE ADKINS: So that I am really not trying to pinpoint any differences in interpretation, because I think that might only serve to confuse rather than to clarify.

All I would like to get is an affirmative statement that what you said this morning insofar as your then definition of the word adjoining and compact, was intended to be controlling insofar as the use of those words in 3.02 is concerned.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gallagher.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Beatrice Miller.

DELEGATE B. MILLER: May I ask the Chairman a question?

THE CHAIRMAN: State your question.

DELEGATE B. MILLER: Would the Chairman be willing to take the sentence, which seems to distress so many delegates, out of the statement, the second sentence, beginning with "each district shall consist of adjoining territory and be compact in form"?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gallagher.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Delegate Miller, I think that since I am only one of